



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,017	09/18/2003	Yves Gaignet	MCA-579	7951
7590	03/06/2006		EXAMINER	
Kevin S. Lemack Nields & Lemack Suite 7 176 E. Main Street Westboro, MA 01581			KURTZ, BENJAMIN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1723	
DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/666,017	GAIGNET ET AL.
	Examiner Benjamin Kurtz	Art Unit 1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-23 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/6/06</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 2/6/2006 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the patents of the disclosure pertain to ion-exchange which is not a feature of the instant application. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 18 cites the limitation "retaining means"; it is assumed the applicant is invoking 35 U.S.C. 112, 6th paragraph. Claim 18 is rejected because the specification does not disclose a retaining means therefore it is impossible to determine a structural equivalent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (4990248). Regarding claim 1, Brown discloses a cylindrical container (figure 1 and column 3 lines 56-57) with fluid inlet and outlet orifices at the first of one of its axial ends (column 2 lines 55-62 and figure 1). Brown also discloses a pretreatment means within the cylindrical container (fig 5 #72 and column 2 lines 32-33). Brown discloses the treatment means being a cartridge including one or more selectively permeable membranes (figure 2 #11 and column 4 lines 6-17). Brown also discloses a separator means dividing the container into internal and external cylindrical spaces consisting of an impermeable barrier layer that surrounds the outer surface of the membrane. The impermeable barrier layer performs the identical function in substantially the same way with substantially the same result as the cylindrical wall, cylindrical skirt and the ring disclosed in the application. The impermeable barrier layer divides the container into two distinct cylindrical spaces that extend from the bottom of the container to the top therefore preventing fluid from bypassing the outer pretreatment as well as providing a flow path for the fluid (figure 2 #15 and column 7 lines 32-42). Brown also discloses that the two cylindrical spaces communicate with one another via one or more passages at the second axial end of the container (figure 5 #74 and

column 7 lines 60-65). Brown also discloses that the pretreatment means are housed in the external space and the treatment means are housed in the internal space (column 7 lines 32-34 and figure 5 pretreatment #72, treatment #70). Brown also discloses the external cylindrical space communicating with an inlet orifice at the first axial end of the container (figure 5 #54 and column 10 lines 44-49). Brown also discloses the internal cylindrical space communicating separately with two outlet orifices at the first axial end of the container (figure 5 #56 and #58 and column 10 line 65 - column 11 line 3 and column 10 lines 52-64). The reverse osmosis cartridge including a cylindrical enclosure (column 12 lines 48-50), a hollow perforated central tube that shares the axis of the cylindrical container (figure 5 and column 5 lines 42-49), and one or more selectively permeable reverse osmosis treatment membranes (column 5 lines 42-44 and column 4 lines 6-16). Brown also discloses that the membrane communicates with the central tube to collect the permeate (column 4 lines 20-23) and that the membrane communicates with the fluid from the pretreatment means and with the outflow of retentate at the exterior of the reverse osmosis membrane via the annular faces of the cartridge (column 4 lines 26-29).

Regarding claims 2 and 4, Brown discloses that the cartridge is a reverse osmosis filtration cartridge (column 2 lines 43-44 and column 3 lines 50-56). A means for providing a sealed connection between the separator means and the cylindrical enclosure of the reverse osmosis cartridge that is attached to and extends around the cylindrical enclosure. Brown discloses a spoked wheel with a cylindrical rim extension that is joined and sealed to the outside of the barrier layer (the outer surface of the

reverse osmosis membrane). The spoked wheel performs the identical function in substantially the same way with substantially the same result as the sleeve with an extended annular seal as disclosed in the application. Both means provide a seal that prevents the inlet fluid from bypassing the pretreatment means.

Regarding claims 5 and 23, Brown discloses the pretreatment means as chosen from the group comprising activated charcoal, polyphosphates and frontal filtration elements (column 8 line 53 – column 9 line 52). The central tube (62) is closed at the same end where fluid enters the reverse osmosis cartridge (sealed at (79) with cap (63) fig. 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 6, 7 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown (248) in view of Regunathan et al. Patent No. 4,645,601. Regarding claim 6, Brown (248) discloses the module including a cylindrical wall (52) closed at the first axial end by a non-removable head (51) including three parallel connectors (54, 56, 58) but does not disclose a non-removable bottom (fig. 5). Regunathan (601) teaches a reverse osmosis assembly with a cylindrical pressure vessel (28) with a non-removable bottom (fig 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the pressure

Art Unit: 1723

vessel as taught by Regunathan (601) with the module as taught by Brown (248). The design of the pressure vessel (28) avoids the piece-by-piece removal and replacement of a used reverse osmosis module (col. 1, lines 61-63).

Regarding claim 7, Brown (248) does not disclose the connectors (54, 56, 58) extend perpendicular to the axis of the container (50). Regunathan (601) teaches a head (30) with three parallel ports (50, 52, 54) with connectors that can take various forms to accommodate the construction of the particular head member with which it is to be associated (col. 3, lines 8-11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the connectors to be perpendicular to the axis of the container to fit a head member adapted to connect to a module with perpendicular ports.

Regarding claims 18-20, Brown further discloses the head (51) and the bottom (63) each include a bush (head bush at 53d, bottom bush at 79d) housing an axial end of the central tube (62), a seal (59d) is between the bush and the tube (63) housed in a groove formed in the central tube (63), and the bush communicates with the second orifice (58) (fig. 5). The bush is considered a retaining means.

Regarding claim 21, Brown (248) further discloses a central truncated cone (joined to the tube (62) at 79') inside the central tube (62) and it projects over a longer distance from the inner face of the bottom than the bush of the bottom (fig. 5).

4. Claims 8, 10-12 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown (248) in view of Regunathan (601) as applied to claims 6-7 above and further in view of Whittier et al. Patent No. 5,078,876. Regarding claim 8,

Brown (248) discloses the separator means include a cylindrical wall (71) and a skirt (53) projecting from the internal face of the head (51) (fig. 5). Brown (248) does not disclose a ring projecting from the face of the bottom. Whittier (876) teaches a water filter with a ring (28) extending from the internal face of the bottom (fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the ring as taught by Whittier (876) in the module of Brown (248). The ring (28) positions the filter medium and defines a flow path (col. 6, lines 5-8).

Regarding claim 12, Brown (248) teaches housing the wall (71) within the skirt (53) therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to house the wall (71) within the ring (28) as taught by Whittier (876) because the skirt provides a bearing surface for the wall (71) for sealing (col. 7, lines 17-19).

Regarding claims 10-11, Brown (248) further discloses the cylindrical skirt (53) has the wall (71) housed concentrically within it with a seal (59d) in an annular recess between them (fig. 5).

Regarding claim 22, Brown (248) further discloses a porous disk (35) in the vicinity of the axial ends of the container but not retaining the pretreatment means. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the disk for the pretreatment means. The porous disks function to keep the carbon granules within the filter (col. 4, lines 61-63).

5. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown (248) in view of Regunathan (601) in view of Whittier (876) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Burrows Patent No. 5,221,473. Regarding claim 13,

Brown (248) in view of Regunathan (601) in view of Whittier (876) teaches a ring (28) of the bottom but do not teach that ring being crenellated. Burrows (473) teaches a crenellated ring of the bottom of a reverse osmosis cartridge (fig.4). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the ring as taught by Burrows (473) in the module as taught by Brown (248) in view of Whittier (876). The ring allows water to pass through it to a central tube (fig. 5, col. 8, lines 24-25).

Regarding claims 14-16, Burrows (473) further discloses the ring includes locating means (160) taking the form of patterns (160) projecting from the internal face of the bottom of the container, the ring holds a cylindrical wall (142) of a separator means at a an axial distance from the face of the bottom, and the ring includes recesses between the crenellations forming axial abutments for the wall (142) (fig. 4 and 5, col. 8, lines 20-28).

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown (248) in view of Regunathan (601) in view of Whittier (876) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Petrucci et al. Patent No. 4,948,505. Brown (248) in view of Regunathan (601) in view of Whittier (876) teach the filter module but do not teach the head being glued or welded together. Petrucci (505) teaches the top cover (134) bonded to the main housing (54) by welding (col. 9, lines 48-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the welding as taught by Petrucci (505) in the filter module because the canister is easily and economically fabricatable (col. 9, lines 3-5).

7. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown (248) in view of Regunathan (601) in view of Whittier (876) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Gundrum et al. Patent No. 5,891,334. Brown (248) in view of Regunathan (601) in view of Whittier (876) teach the filter module but do not teach centering fingers. Gundrum (334) teaches a cylindrical separator wall (33) with radially extending fingers (34) extending to the container wall (25) in the vicinity of each axial end of the wall (33) (fig. 2 and 5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the fingers as taught by Gundrum (334). The fingers (34) define a flow passageway between the separation wall (33) and the container wall (25) (col. 4, lines 51-67).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments, see page 1, lines 3-5, filed 2/6/2006, with respect to the abstract have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of the abstract has been withdrawn.

9. Applicant's arguments, see page 1, lines 6-9, filed 2/6/2006, with respect to claims 6-23 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of claims 6-23 has been withdrawn.

10. Applicant's arguments filed 2/6/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Brown (248) discloses the central tube (12 or 62) being hollow by virtue of there being a cavity or space (40 or 87) within the tube (fig. 2 and 5). The addition of a post filter does not fill the entire space within the tube nor does it affect the operation or

function of the filter as it still includes all claimed limitations of claims 1-2 and 4-5 of the instant application.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin Kurtz whose telephone number is 571-272-8211. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker can be reached on 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bk 3/1/2006
-+

John Kim
JOHN KIM
Primary PATENT EXAMINER